

Amendments to the Drawings:

Attached hereto are Replacement sheets illustrating Figures 1 and 2-3, respectively. Replacement sheet Figure 1 schematically adds a data logger 35 and a dynamo 36, as described in the paragraph spanning pages 8-9 of the originally-filed specification. An arrow is added to replacement sheet Figures 2 and 3 to indicate the movable arrangement of the slide together with the braking device as described in the paragraph on page 7, lines 5-21 of the originally-filed specification.

Enclosure: Replacement Sheets - Figure 1; and

Figures 2-3.

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Action mailed July 18, 2007 in which claims 15, 23, 25 and 27 were objected to as containing allowable subject matter. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the comments set forth below.

By this Amendment, the specification is revised, independent claim 13 is amended and dependent claims 15-16, 20-21, 23-25 and 29 are amended, claim 30 is canceled and new claims 33-35 are presented. Claim 35 is allowable claim 15 rewritten as an independent claim and should be allowed over the art of record. In addition, two Replacement Sheets of drawings are submitted. Accordingly, claims 13-29 and 31-35 are pending in the present application.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because certain claimed features were missing from the drawings. Replacement sheets of Figure 1-3 are attached hereto that 1) add an arrow to Figures 2 and 3 indicating movement of the slide together with the braking device, as described on page 7, lines 5-21 of the originally-filed specification; and 2) schematically add a data logger and a dynamo 36 to Figure 1 according to the description at page 4, lines 2-16 and page 8, lines 12-25 of the originally-filed specification. The specification has been revised to refer to the new reference numerals. Accordingly, it is believed that Figure 1-3 fully comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a) and withdrawal of that objection is respectfully requested.

The specification was objected to for the reasons set forth from the bottom of page 3 to the top of page 6 of the Action. The foregoing amendments to the specification add the proper headings and delete reference to a specific claim thereby overcoming the

objections to the specification. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-32 were objected to because of the informalities noted in the middle of page 6 of the Action. The foregoing amendments to the claims take into consideration the Examiner's comments and adopt those suggestions. Accordingly, the objection to the claims should be overcome. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-21 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because of the recitation of the conjunction "and/or". In order to clarify claims 20-21, they have been amended to refer to an open loop control unit. While claims 29 and new claim 33 are directed to a closed loop control unit. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20-21 and 29 are fully definite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB 435,742. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

GB 435,742 is directed to card roller mounting machine where a fillet material is applied under tension to a driven roll. Claim 13 has been amended to more clearly recite that the braking device is positioned on a **slide** and it is the slide that moves together with the breaking device. In addition, the recited slide of claim 13 rests on the stop means during the winding operation, and the force measuring device is positioned between the slide and the stop means so that the force measuring device is directly subjected to the support force and directly measures it. There is no translation via gears or levers or any means which decreases the effectiveness of this measurement (due to friction, for example) in the claimed invention.

In contrast to the claimed invention, the Examiner regards a small bed plate 15 as being the recited slide of the claimed invention. However, bed plate 15 of GB 435,742 is not movable at all, but is fixed to a bracket 17 mounted on a vertical side plate 7. Since bed plate 15 is fixed to a bracket, it cannot move together with the braking device as required by claim 13 of the present application.

In addition, it is questionable whether the pointer 25 and the scale 24 disclosed in GB 435,742 “directly measure, at least in the winding operation, the support force of the slide on the stop means”, as recited in independent claim 13 of the present application. The pointer 25 and scale 24 are coupled to a pivotal controller 13, and as long as everything is in order, controller 13 does not have any influence on the force acting on the mounting point of the wedge-shaped cam 19 (or as recited in the claim 13, support force). In normal operation, the wedge-shaped bracket or cam 19 of GB 435,742 rests against the abutment provided by set screw 20. Only if the pivotal controller 13 pivots counterclockwise around pivot point 14 of GB 435,742, does lever 30 of GB 435,742 have some influence on the wedge-shaped cam 19 so that it releases the retarding friction applied to the fillet. Consequently, the measuring instrument of GB 435,742 only shows what actually happens at controller 13. According to GB 435,742, the fillet of card-clothing is wound three times around the drum between the controller 13 and the wedge-shaped plate or cam 19 that applies pressure to the fillet. The retarding friction taught by GB 435,742 is therefore influenced by the friction characteristics between the fillet of the card clothing and the drum sections 10, 11 and 12 of GB 435,742. The force measurement of GB 435,742 takes place with the influence of these three-sections in between.

The claimed invention set forth in claim 13 recites a slide with a braking device positioned thereon that presses immediately or directly on the recited force measuring device. The reason why the braking device is positioned on a slide is, to have as less friction as possible, so that no additional influences, especially frictional influences, on the measurement exists. As a result the force measurement of the claimed invention is much more precise and directly shows the force for winding the card clothing onto a roll.

In view of the above argued missing elements, GB 435,742 cannot anticipate the claimed invention because it fails to disclose each and every recited feature of the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 435,742 in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,950,984 to Russell. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 435,742 in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,590,537 to Hennig. Claims 17-19, 21-22 and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 435,742 in view of WO 02/46505 to Bocht. Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 435,742 in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,950,984 to Russell and further in view of Hennig. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 435,742 in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,950,984 to Russell and further in view of Bocht. And, finally, claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 435,742 in view of Hennig and further in view of Bocht.

Russell is directed to a force transducer for a strain gage and consequently cannot cure the elements that are missing from GB 435,742. Hennig is directed to a disc-brake

cleaning apparatus. No where does Henning address a braking device positioned on a slide where the slide together with the braking device is movably arranged substantially in a direction longitudinal to the winding of the card clothing. Consequently, Henning also fails to disclose, teach or suggest the modifications necessary to meet the limitations of independent claim 13.

Bocht, likewise, fails to disclose the features argued above that are missing from the base reference to GB 435,742. While Bocht is directed to a device for drawing up card clothing, no where does it disclose, let alone teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art, the slide that moves together with the braking device, the recited slide of claim 13 that rests on the stop means during the winding operation, and the force measuring device being positioned between the slide and the stop means so that the force measuring device is directly subjected to the support force and directly measures it as required by independent claim 13 of the present application. Accordingly, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the would not have combined GB 435,742 and Bocht to achieve the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 13-29 and 31-35 are allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the application and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that the prosecution of the application would be advanced by a personal interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 17, 2007



Catherine M. Voorhees
Registration No. 33,074
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax : (202) 344-8300

CMV/elw

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS\89615\